Date(s) of Assessment:	Project:
Assessor(s):	Review Examined:

		Y, N,	F, O	Comments
		NA	_, _	2 233333
REV	VIEW PREPARATION			
1	Have standards been identified to clearly define the review process?			
2	Were guidelines used to prepare for the review?			
3	Has the project submitted any request for deviations or waivers to the defined process?			
4	Have entrance and exit criteria been established for the review			
5	Was an agenda prepared and distributed in advance of the review?			
6	Was the review package provided with ample time to review?			
7	Were the appropriate stakeholders in attendance?			
REV	REVIEW CONTENT			
8	Were the goals of the review and any review prerequisites provided?			
9	Does the SCR clearly reflect an end of the definition study phase?			
10	Was the review process addressed, including the method for capturing Requests for Action (RFAs), risks, or issues?			
11	Was an overview of the mission/object design provided (e.g., mission goals, science requirements, key functionality, operational characteristics)?			
12	Were the system development, support, and user organizations identified?			3
13	Were the organizational responsibilities defined?			

Revision: 2.0 Page 1 of 4

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

		Y, N, NA	F, O	Comments
14	Were key personnel and their responsibilities described?			
15	Were the Software requirements that are to be implemented by the system described?			
16	Were technical requirements presented?			
17	Were high-level user requirements summarized?			
18	Were high-level software design drivers presented?			
19	Were major hardware/software tradeoffs and their relative risk considered and presented?			
20	Did the proposed design approach include software and computer systems?			
21	Were communication interfaces between computer systems and the total system described?			
22	Were the proposed computer system platforms and operational environment(s) described?			
23	Were requirements flowed down to computer systems and software?			
24	Were software requirements delineated by function?			
25	Were major system interfaces (e.g., between spacecraft, instruments, users, ground systems) described?			
26	Were the operational interfaces and scenarios presented?			
27	Were security issues presented?			
28	Were safety issues presented?			
29	Were technical risks, mitigation plans, and issues documented with plans for			
	tracking and closure?			
DOG	DOCUMENTATION STATUS			
30	Does the review package include preliminary requirements?			
31	Is supporting documentation for the proposed design approach and major system interfaces provided in the review			
	package?			

Revision: 2.0 Page 2 of 4

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

		Y, N, NA	F, O	Comments
POS	T REVIEW ACTIVITIES			
32	At the conclusion of the review is an understanding reached on the validity and degree of completeness of the System Concept Review?			
33	Did all designated parties concur in the acceptability of the System Concept Review?			
34	Are there any risks, issues, or request for actions (RFAs) that require follow-up?			
35	Is there a process in place for reviewing and tracking the closure of risks, issues, or RFAs?			
36	Have all artifacts been placed under formal configuration control (e.g., review packages)?			
37	Were Lessons Learned addressed and captured?			

REFERENCE ITEMS/DOCUMENTS

GSFC System Review Office Design Review Guidelines

Review Definition – The SCR is held to assure that the objectives and requirements of the item being designed are understood and that the proposed approach will meet these requirements. The emphasis should be on the requirements, how they flow down, the proposed design concept, and the definition of the major system interfaces. The SCR should occur near the end of the conceptual design or study phase on larger programs. For smaller programs, the SCR may be combined with the next level of review. The review should also present the major design alternatives considered, the relative risk for each, and the reasons for the approach chosen by the design team. The output from the SCR is a baseline design subject to the closure of any action items resulting from the review. This then becomes the baseline for the detailed design.

Revision: 2.0 Page 3 of 4

Date(s) of Assessment:		Project:		
Assessor(s):				
COM	COMMENTS PAGE of			
#	Comments from assessment			

Revision: 2.0 Page 4 of 4

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation